

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Re-examination and favorable reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following comments are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 3, and 5 - 12, are pending in the application. Currently, claims 1 - 3 and 5 - 12 stand rejected.

By the present amendment, claims 10 - 12 have been amended to correct their claim dependency from cancelled claim 4 to claim 1. Further, new claims 48 - 52 have been added to the application.

In the office action mailed October 23, 2009, claims 1, 2, and 10 - 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,728,610 to Marshall et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,710,568 to Rice; and claims 3 and 5 - 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall et al. in view of Rice and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,990,432 to McCarthy, IV et al.

The foregoing rejections are traversed by the instant response.

Claim 1 is directed to a gas turbine engine, comprising: a compressor section; a combustion section downstream of the compressor section; a turbine section downstream of the combustion section; a casing surrounding the compressor section, combustion section and turbine section; an electronic controller mounted to the casing, the electronic controller controlling and monitoring operation of the engine and having a microserver, wherein the microserver generates a wireless system surrounding the engine and adapted to connect to the Internet.

A review of the rejection of claim 1 in the office action shows that the Examiner has misapprehended the teachings of U.S.

Patent No. 6,728,610 to Marshall et al. The Examiner says that Marshall et al. discloses an electronic controller mounted to a gas turbine engine and cites column 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 12 of Marshall et al. to support this statement. A review of this section of Marshall et al. says that the server system 12 can be coupled to at least one aircraft engine and can include a process 20 coupled to the engine with input/output circuitry. Processor 20 interfaces with operator controls and the aircraft engine via the input/output circuitry. The processor can be electronically coupled to an engine control system. The term "coupled" includes embodiments where the server system is permanently connected to or a part of the engine control system. There is absolutely nothing in this section that says that the server or the processor is "mounted" to the engine. The Examiner has misconstrued the word "coupled". Clearly, there is nothing in Marshall et al. which teaches or suggests mounting the electronic controller to the engine casing. Still further, there is nothing in Marshall which teaches or suggests providing an electronic controller which has a microserver which generates a wireless system "surrounding the engine" and adapted to connect to the Internet. Marshall et al. is talking about a processor which is electrically coupled to a engine control system and which interfaces with operator controls and the engine via input/output circuitry.

With regard to the secondary reference to Rice, it fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Marshall et al. Rice is directed to a tubing or electrical lead support which serves to communicate fluid/electrical signals to controls and accessories. There is nothing in Rice which would teaching mounting an electronic controller to an engine casing, which controller has a microserver which generates a wireless system

"surrounding the engine" and adapted to connect to the Internet. In 1971, such electronic controllers, microservers for generating a wireless system surrounding the engine, and the Internet were unknown. Thus, even if Rice is combined with Marshall et al., one would not arrive at the claimed invention.

Further, there is no reason to combine Rice with Marshall et al. Rice is directed to a mechanical tubing system (see column 4, lines 29 - 41, for housing leads or conducting fluids, neither of which would be employed by the system of Marshall et al. since Marshall et al. gets its maintenance information by communicating with the engine controls.

For these reasons, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 and 10 - 12 are allowable for the same reason as claim 1 as well as on their own accord.

With regard to the rejection of claims 3 and 5 - 9, McCarthy does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Marshall et al. Thus, at a minimum, these claims are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

The objection to the dependency of claims 10 - 12 has been noted and appropriate correction has been made.

New claims 48 - 52 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1 as well as on their own accord.

For the foregoing reasons, the instant application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe an additional amendment is needed to place the case in condition for allowance, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fee is believed to be due as a result of this response.

If the Director determines that a fee is due, he is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 21-0279.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID C. LODA ET AL.

By /Barry L. Kelmachter #29999/

Barry L. Kelmachter  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No.: 29,999

BACHMAN & LaPOINTE, P.C.  
900 Chapel Street  
Suite 1201  
New Haven, CT 06510-2802

Telephone: 203-777-6628 x112  
Telefax: 203-865-0297  
E-mail: docket@bachlap.com

Date: January 25, 2010